

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 19, 20, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 43, and 48 has been amended, FIG. 7 has been amended according to the Examiner's suggestion, and the Specification has been amended to update the status of the parent application.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

Claims 19-26, 28-46, and 48-58 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

REQUEST FOR RECOGNITION OF PARENT APPLICATION:

On page 1, box 12, of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges receipt of the priority document, but does not refer to the parent application, 09/359,128. Additionally, the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system also appears not to acknowledge this domestic priority claim, which was made in Continuing Utility Patent Application Transmittal form at box 18 on filing the instant application. As such, it is respectfully requested that the status of the application be reflected in future actions and/or in the PAIR system to prevent confusion.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS:

In the Office Action at page 2, the drawings were objected to. In view of the accompanying separate Letter to the Examiner Requesting Approval of Changes to the Drawings, corrections to FIG. 7 have been requested. Therefore, the outstanding drawing objections should be resolved. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS:

In the Office Action at pages 2-3, the Examiner objects to the claims as set forth therein. The claims have been generally amended as suggested by the Examiner.

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, the Examiner objects to claim 31 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75 as being in improper dependent form. In view of the amendment to claim 31, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding objection to claim 31 is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action at pages 4-11, the Examiner rejects claims 19, 20, 25, 26, 29, 34, 35,

43, 48-50, 53, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Ide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,770).

This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

By way of review, Ide et al. uses an edge width adjusting table generator circuit 18 to create a table 19 which contains a relationship between short patterns and quantities of edge deviations associated with short patterns according to measured data. For other patterns, an interpolation is performed based upon the measured data in the table 19. The table 19 is organized according to three Addresses: Adr. 1, Adr. 2, Adr. 3 as shown in FIGs. 10, 11A, 11B, 16A and 16B. (Col. 7, lines 36-58, col. 10, lines 51-66, col. 12, line 48 to col. 13, line 30; FIGs. 3, 10-11B, 15-16B). However, as shown in FIGs. 1, 2, 10, and 15, the write pulse for each mark is a single pulse. There is no suggestion that the write pulse is a multi-pulse or that such amounts e_i , f_i should be used in the context of specific ones of pulses used to record a mark.

In contrast, claim 19 recites, among other features, "a generator to control generation of a write pulse waveform in which the present mark comprises a first pulse and a last pulse which are determined in accordance with one or more grouping tables and the discriminated magnitudes of the present mark and the leading space, the one or more grouping tables storing width data of first and/or last pulses for the write pulse waveform to be generated varying according to the different stored potential magnitudes of the present mark of the input data and the leading space such that the generated write pulse waveform is generated without regard for a trailing space of the present mark." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Ide et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 19.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Ide et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 20, 29, 34, 35, 43, and 48.

Claims 25, 26, 49-50, 53 and 54 are deemed patentable due to least to their depending from corresponding claims 19, 34 and 48.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action at pages 11-12, the Examiner rejects claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Ide et al., Hara (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,055) and Furukawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,026). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Even assuming arguendo that Hara and Furukawa et al. disclose the features as set forth in the Office Action, neither Hara nor Furukawa et al. are relied upon as curing the above noted deficiency of Ide et al. as applied to claim 35, from which claim 36 depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 36.

In the Office Action at page 12, the Examiner rejects claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Ide et al., and Nishiuchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,568,461). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Since the Examiner does not rely upon Nishiuchi et al. as curing the above noted defect of Ide et al. as applied to claim 35, from which claim 37 depends, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the invention as recited in claim 37.

STATUS OF CLAIMS NOT REJECTED:

On pages 13-15 of the Office Action, the Examiner allows claims 21-24, 30, 38, 42, and 55-58, objects to claims 28, 32, 33, 39, 40, 51, and 52 for various typographical reasons and/or for depending from rejected claims, but as otherwise containing allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI LLP

By: 

James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

Date: JAN 17, 2006

SERIAL NO. 09/609,822

DOCKET NO. 1293.1076D1

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Pursuant to the enclosed separate Letter to the Examiner Requesting Approval of Drawing Changes, amendment to FIG. 7 is respectfully requested.